

# A Beta Way: A Tutorial For Using Beta Regression in Psychological Research

Jason Geller<sup>1</sup>, Robert Kubinec<sup>2</sup>, Chelsea M. Parlett Pelleriti<sup>3</sup>, and Matti Vuorre<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Psychology and Neuroscience, Boston College

<sup>2</sup>University of South Carolina

<sup>3</sup>Canva

<sup>4</sup>Tilburg University

## Abstract

Rates, percentages, and proportions are common outcomes in psychology and the social sciences. These outcomes are often analyzed using models that assume normality, but this practice overlooks important features of the data, such as their natural bounds at 0 and 1. As a result, estimates can become distorted. In contrast, treating such outcomes as beta-distributed respects these limits and can yield more accurate estimates. Despite these advantages, the use of beta models in applied research remains limited. Our goal is to provide researchers with practical guidance for adopting beta regression models, illustrated with an example drawn from the psychological literature. We begin by introducing the beta distribution and beta regression, emphasizing key components and assumptions. Next, using data from a learning and memory study, we demonstrate how to fit a beta regression model in R with the Bayesian package `brms` and how to interpret results on the response scale. We also discuss model extensions, including zero-inflated, zero- and one-inflated, and ordered beta models. Basic familiarity with regression modeling and R is assumed. To promote wider adoption of these methods, we provide detailed code and materials at <https://zenodo.org/records/16895241>.

*Keywords:* beta regression, beta distribution, R tutorial, psychology, learning and memory

Jason Geller  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7459-4505>

Robert Kubinec  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6655-4119>

Chelsea M. Parlett Pelleriti  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9301-1398>

Matti Vuorre  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5052-066X>

The analyses herein were not preregistered. Data, code, and materials for this manuscript can be found at <https://zenodo.org/records/16895241>. The authors have no conflicts of interest to disclose. Author roles were classified using the Contributor Role Taxonomy (CRediT; <https://credit.niso.org/>) as follows: Jason Geller: Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal analysis, Project administration, Resources, Visualization, Writing - original draft; Robert Kubinec: Formal analysis, Validation, Writing - review & editing; Chelsea M. Parlett Pelleriti: Formal analysis, Writing - review & editing; Matti Vuorre: Formal analysis, Resources, Supervision, Validation, Writing - review & editing

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Jason Geller, Department of Psychology and Neuroscience, Boston College, McGuinn 300z, Chestnut Hill, MA 2467, USA. Email: [drjasongeller@gmail.com](mailto:drjasongeller@gmail.com)

 Preprint

This manuscript is currently **under review** and has not been peer-reviewed. Content is **subject to change**. Please feel free to provide feedback!

## Introduction

Many outcomes in psychological research are naturally expressed as proportions or percentages. These include the proportion of correct responses on a test (e.g., Kornell and Bjork (2008)), the proportion of time a participant fixates on a stimulus in an eye-tracking task (e.g., James et al., 2025), or the proportion of respondents endorsing a particular belief (e.g., Costello et al., 2024). A central question for studies involving proportional data is how to analyze these outcomes in a statistically appropriate and interpretable way.

Researchers frequently default to linear models that assume Gaussian (normal) distributions, such as t-tests, ANOVAs, and linear regression. However, these models make strong assumptions: (1) residuals are normally distributed, (2) the outcome is unbounded (from  $-\infty$  to  $\infty$ ), and (3) variance is constant across the range of the data. These assumptions are rarely satisfied in practice (Sladekova & Field, 2024), and they are especially ill-suited for proportional outcomes, which are bounded between 0 and 1 and often exhibit heteroscedasticity—non-constant variance, particularly near the boundaries (Ferrari & Cribari-Neto, 2004; Paolino, 2001; Smithson & Verkuilen, 2006). Violating these assumptions can lead to biased estimates and spurious inferences, especially when many observations cluster near 0 or 1.

In some cases, a generalized linear model (GLM) can relax the assumption of normality. For example, binomial and Bernoulli models—often referred to as logistic regression when used with a logit link—are appropriate when the outcome is binary (0/1) or represents the number of successes out of a fixed number of trials. These models, however, rely on data that arise from discrete trial structures. They tend to perform poorly when the observed proportions are truly continuous or when the data show extra variability (overdispersion), particularly when many values occur near the boundaries of the scale (0 and 1).

The challenges of analyzing proportional data are not new (see Bartlett, 1936). Fortunately, several existing approaches address the limitations of commonly used models. One such approach is beta regression, an extension of the generalized linear model that employs the beta distribution (Ferrari & Cribari-Neto, 2004; Paolino, 2001). Beta regression offers a flexible and robust solution for modeling proportional data directly by accounting for boundary effects and over-dispersion, making it a valuable alternative to traditional binomial models. This approach is particularly well-suited for psychological research because it can handle both the bounded nature of proportional data and the non-constant variance often encountered in these datasets (Sladekova & Field, 2024). In addition, the direct modeling of proportions allows comparability across tasks and scales, and can be particularly valuable when only the proportional data is available, as is often the case with secondary data that lack item-level structure or point values.

While in this paper we will focus on proportional-responses that lie between 0 and 1—it is important to note that our analysis applies to any bounded continuous scale. Any bounded scale can be mapped to lie within 0 and 1 without resulting in a loss of information as the transformation is linear.<sup>1</sup> Consequently, a scale that has natural end points of -1,234 and +8,451—or any other end points on the real number line short of infinity—can be modeled using the approaches we describe in this paper.

## A Beta Way Is Possible

With the widespread availability of open-source software such as R (R Core Team, 2024) and its extensive ecosystem of user-developed packages, advanced models like beta regression have become increas-

<sup>1</sup>Specifically, for any continuous bounded variable  $x$ , we can rescale this variable to lie within 0 and 1 by using the formula  $x' = \frac{x - \min(x)}{\max(x) - \min(x)}$  where  $0 \leq x' \leq 1$ .

40 ingly accessible to applied researchers. Yet, their adoption in psychology remains relatively limited. One  
 41 contributing factor may be the lack of domain-specific examples that demonstrate how these models address  
 42 common challenges in psychological data. Although recent years have seen a growing interest in beta regres-  
 43 sion, and a number of useful tutorials are available (Bendixen & Purzycki, 2023; Coretta & Bürkner, 2025;  
 44 Heiss, 2021; e.g., Smithson & Verkuilen, 2006; Vuorre, 2019), these resources often either focus on basic  
 45 implementation or briefly mention extensions without detailing how they can be applied to psychologically  
 46 relevant research questions.

47 The present tutorial aims to help bridge this gap by providing a comprehensive, applied introduction  
 48 to beta regression and several of its extensions. In addition to the standard beta model, we walk through zero-  
 49 inflated, zero-one-inflated, and ordered beta regression. These models are particularly useful for researchers  
 50 working with proportion outcomes that include boundary values (e.g., exact 0s or 1s) or responses with an  
 51 inherent ordinal structure. Our goal is to offer practical guidance that enables psychological researchers to  
 52 implement, interpret, and report these models in ways that directly support their empirical questions.

53 Beyond model specification, we place strong emphasis on interpreting results on the response scale—  
 54 that is, in terms of probabilities and proportions—rather than relying on often difficult to interpret parameters.  
 55 This focus makes the models more accessible and meaningful for psychological applications, where effects  
 56 are often easier to communicate when framed on the original scale of the outcome (e.g., changes in recall  
 57 accuracy or task performance). Throughout, we provide reproducible code and annotated examples to help  
 58 readers implement and interpret these models in their own work.

59 We begin the tutorial with a non-technical overview of the beta distribution and its core pa-  
 60 rameters. We then walk through the process of estimating beta regression models using the R package  
 61 `brms` (Bürkner, 2017), illustrating each step with applied examples. To guide interpretation, we empha-  
 62 size coefficients, predicted probabilities, and marginal effects calculated using the `{marginaleffects}` pack-  
 63 age (Arel-Bundock et al., 2024). We also introduce several useful extensions—zero-inflated (ZIB), zero-  
 64 one-inflated (ZOIB), and ordered beta regression—that enable researchers to model outcomes that include  
 65 boundary values. Finally, all code and materials used in this tutorial are fully reproducible and avail-  
 66 able via our GitHub repository: [https://github.com/jgeller112/beta\\_regression\\_tutorial](https://github.com/jgeller112/beta_regression_tutorial) and on Zenodo  
 67 <https://zenodo.org/records/16895241><sup>2</sup>.

## 68 Beta Distribution

69 Proportional data pose some challenges for standard modeling approaches: The data are bounded  
 70 between 0 and 1 and often exhibit non-constant variance (heteroscedasticity) (Ferrari & Cribari-Neto, 2004;  
 71 Paolino, 2001). Common distributions used within the generalized linear model frameworks often fail to  
 72 capture these properties adequately, which can necessitate alternative modeling strategies.

73 While we do not have time to delve fully into its derivation, the beta distribution is a preferred  
 74 distribution for this type of response because of certain unique properties. The beta distribution is defined as  
 75 a distribution of the uncertainty of probabilities, which must lie within 0 and 1. As a consequence, the beta  
 76 distribution is the maximum entropy distribution for any bounded continuous random variable, which means

---

<sup>2</sup>In this article, we try to limit code where possible; however, the online version has all the code needed to reproduce all analyses herein. Furthermore, to promote transparency and reproducibility, the tutorial was written in R version 4.5.1 (R Core Team (2024)) using Quarto (v.1.5.54), an open-source publishing system that allows for dynamic and static documents. This allows figures, tables, and text to be programmatically included directly in the manuscript, ensuring that all results are seamlessly integrated into the document. In addition, we use the `rix` (Rodrigues & Baumann, 2025) R package which harnesses the power of the `nix` (Dolstra & contributors, 2006) ecosystem to help with computational reproducibility. Not only does this give us a snapshot of the packages used to create the current manuscript, but it also takes a snapshot of system dependencies used at run-time. This way reproducers can easily re-use the exact same environment by installing the `nix` package manager and using the included `default.nix` file to set up the right environment. The README file in the GitHub repository contains detailed information on how to set this up to reproduce the contents of the current manuscript, including a video.

77 that the beta distribution can represent the full range of possibilities of such a scale.<sup>3</sup> As a consequence, if we  
 78 have a continuous scale with upper and lower bounds—and no other special conditions—the beta distribution  
 79 will in principle provide a very good approximation of the uncertainty of the scale.


80 Typically, the expected value (or mean) of the response variable is the central estimand scholars want  
 81 to estimate. A model should specify how this expected value depends on explanatory variables through two  
 82 main components: a linear predictor, which combines the explanatory variables in a linear form ( $a + b_1x_1 +$   
 83  $b_2x_2$ , etc.), and a link function, which connects the expected value of the response variable to the linear  
 84 predictor (e.g.,  $E[Y] = g(a + b_1x_1 + b_2x_2)$ ). In addition, a random component specifies the distribution  
 85 of the response variable around its expected value (such as Poisson or binomial distributions, which belong  
 86 to the exponential family) (Nelder & Wedderburn, 1972). Together, these components provide a flexible  
 87 framework for modeling data with different distributional properties.

88 The beta distribution is continuous and restricted to values between 0 and 1 (exclusive). Its two  
 89 parameters—commonly called `shape1` ( $\alpha$ ) and `shape2` ( $\beta$ )—govern the distribution's location, skewness, and  
 90 spread. By adjusting these parameters, the distribution can take many functional forms (e.g., it can be sym-  
 91 metric, skewed, U-shaped, or even approximately uniform; see Figure 1).

92 To illustrate, consider a test question worth seven points. Suppose a participant scores five out of  
 93 seven. The number of points received (5) can be treated as  $\alpha$ , and the number of points missed (2) as  $\beta$ . The  
 94 resulting beta distribution would be skewed toward higher values, reflecting a high performance (yellow line  
 95 in Figure 1; “`beta(5, 2)`”). Reversing these values would produce a distribution skewed toward lower values,  
 96 representing poorer performance (green line in Figure 1; “`beta(2, 5)`”).

**Figure 1**

*beta distributions with different shape1 and shape2 parameters.*



## 97 I Can't Believe It's Not beta

98 While the standard parameterization of the beta distribution uses  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ , a reparameterization to a  
 99 mean ( $\mu$ ) and precision ( $\phi$ ) is more useful for regression models. The mean represents the expected value  
 100 of the distribution, while the dispersion, which is inversely related to variance, reflects how concentrated

---

<sup>3</sup>Technically, this maximum entropy condition is satisfied because the  $\text{beta}(1,1)$  distribution is uniform over its support.

101 the distribution is around the mean, with higher values indicating a narrower distribution and lower values  
 102 indicating a wider one. The connections between the beta distribution's parameters are shown in Equation 1.  
 103 Importantly, the variance depends on the average value of the response because uncertainty intervals need to  
 104 adjust for how close the value of the response is to the boundary.

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{Shape 1: } a = \mu\phi & \text{Mean: } \mu = \frac{a}{a+b} \\ \text{Shape 2: } b = (1-\mu)\phi & \text{Precision: } \phi = a+b \\ & \text{Variance: } var = \frac{\mu \cdot (1-\mu)}{1+\phi} \end{array} \quad (1)$$

105 Thus, beta regression allows modeling both the mean and precision of the outcome distribution. To  
 106 ensure that  $\mu$  stays between 0 and 1, we apply a link function, which allows linear modeling of the mean on  
 107 an unbounded scale. A common link-function choice is the logit, but other functions such as the probit or  
 108 complementary log-log are possible.

109 The logit function,  $\text{logit}(\mu) = \log\left(\frac{\mu}{1-\mu}\right)$  links the mean to log-odds which are unbounded, making  
 110 linear modeling possible. The logit here no longer carries the same literal *odds* interpretation because there  
 111 are no corresponding counts of “successes” and “failures.” Instead, the logit transform here simply maps the  
 112 mean of the distribution to the real line. The inverse of the logit, called the logistic function, maps the linear  
 113 predictor  $\eta$  back to the original scale of the data  $\left(\mu = \frac{1}{1+e^{-\eta}}\right)$ . The coefficients describe how predictors shift  
 114 the *average proportion* on the logit scale here. Similarly, the strictly positive dispersion parameter is usually  
 115 modeled through a log link function, ensuring it remains positive.

116 By accounting for the observations' natural limits and non-constant variance across different val-  
 117 ues, the beta distribution is useful in psychology where outcomes like performance rates or response scales  
 118 frequently exhibit these features.

## 119 Bayesian Approach to Beta Regression

120 Beta regression models can be estimated using either frequentist or Bayesian methods. In this paper,  
 121 we adopt a Bayesian framework because it facilitates the estimation and interpretation of more complex  
 122 models (Gelman et al., 2013; Johnson et al., 2022; McElreath, 2020). Additionally, the use of Bayesian statistics  
 123 in psychology has been steadily growing (Pfadt et al., 2025). In principle, most Bayesian models can also be  
 124 estimated with frequentist approaches (e.g., maximum likelihood). However, as model complexity increases,  
 125 frequentist estimation often requires additional adjustments such as bootstrapping or custom optimization,  
 126 whereas Bayesian modeling handles these extensions more naturally through hierarchical structure and prior  
 127 specification.

128 A common concern is that Bayesian methods are slower than frequentist ones. While this is true  
 129 in general, modern Bayesian computation engines are efficient, and in explanatory modeling our priority  
 130 is to specify appropriate estimands rather than to optimize for computation speed. Moreover, we use the  
 131 `{brms}` package (Bürkner, 2017), which provides a high-level interface to Stan (Team, 2023) and uses familiar  
 132 R formula syntax (similar to `lm()`), making advanced Bayesian modeling accessible to researchers with  
 133 standard regression backgrounds. The package also supports parallelization, which substantially reduces  
 134 computation time for large datasets.

135 There are several important differences between our Bayesian analysis and the frequentist methods  
 136 readers may be more familiar with—most notably, the absence of *t*- and *p*-values. To estimate models, the  
 137 `{brms}` package uses Stan's computational algorithms to draw random samples from the posterior distribu-  
 138 tion, which represents uncertainty about the model parameters. This posterior is conceptually analogous to a  
 139 frequentist sampling distribution. By default, Bayesian models run 4 chains with 2,000 iterations each. The  
 140 first 1,000 iterations per chain are warmup and are discarded. The remaining 1,000 iterations per chain are

141 retained as posterior draws, yielding 4,000 total post-warmup draws across all chains. From these draws, we  
 142 can compute the posterior mean (analogous to a frequentist point estimate) and the 95% credible interval  
 143 (Cr.I.), which is often compared to a confidence interval.

144 In addition, an important part of Bayesian analyses is prior specification. Priors encode our assumptions  
 145 about plausible parameter values before observing the data and allow the model to regularize estimates,  
 146 especially when data are sparse or parameters are weakly identified. To help bridge the conceptual gap for  
 147 users more familiar with frequentist models, we begin with the default priors (flat/non-informative) provided  
 148 by `{brms}`. These priors are intentionally non-informative, and in many applications produce results that  
 149 closely align with frequentist estimates, while still offering the flexibility and interpretive advantages of a  
 150 Bayesian framework. We strongly urge readers to consider prior specification strongly in all their work.

151 To ease readers into Bayesian data analysis we provide a metric known as the *probability of direction*  
 152 (*pd*), which reflects the probability that a parameter is strictly positive or negative. When a uniform  
 153 prior is used (all values equally likely in the prior), a *pd* of 95%, 97.5%, 99.5%, and 99.95% corresponds  
 154 approximately to two-sided p-values of .10, .05, .01, and .001 (i.e.,  $\text{pd} \approx 1 - p/2$  for symmetric posteriors  
 155 with weak/flat priors) (see Figure 2 for an illustrative comparison). For directional hypotheses, the *pd* can be  
 156 interpreted as roughly equivalent to one minus the *p*-value (Marsman & Wagenmakers, 2016).

157 For reasons of space, we refer readers unfamiliar to Bayesian data analysis to several existing books  
 158 on the topic (Gelman et al., 2013; Kruschke, 2015; McElreath, 2020). In addition, we assume readers are  
 159 familiar with R, but those in need of a refresher should find Wickham et al. (2023) useful.

## 160 Beta Regression Tutorial

### 161 Example Data

162 Throughout this tutorial, we analyze data from a memory experiment examining whether the fluency  
 163 of an instructor's delivery affects recall performance (Wilford et al., 2020, Experiment 1A). Instructor  
 164 fluency—marked by expressive gestures, dynamic vocal tone, and confident pacing—has been shown to  
 165 influence students' perceptions of learning, often leading learners to rate fluent instructors more favorably  
 166 (Carpenter et al., 2013). However, previous research suggests that these impressions do not reliably translate  
 167 into improved memory performance (e.g., Carpenter et al., 2013; Toftness et al., 2017; Witherby & Car-  
 168 penter, 2022). In contrast, Wilford et al. (2020) found that participants actually recalled more information  
 169 after watching a fluent instructor compared to a disfluent one. This surprising finding makes the dataset a  
 170 compelling case study for analyzing proportion data, as recall was scored out of 10 possible idea units per  
 171 video.

172 In Experiment 1A, participants ( $N = 96$ ) watched two short instructional videos, each delivered  
 173 either fluently or disfluently. Fluent videos featured instructors with smooth delivery and natural pacing,  
 174 while disfluent videos included hesitations, monotone speech, and awkward pauses. After a distractor task,  
 175 participants completed a free recall test, writing down as much content as they could remember from each  
 176 video within a three-minute window. Their recall was then scored for the number of idea units correctly  
 177 remembered.

---

#### Listing 1 Data needed to run examples

---


```
# get data here from project folder
file <- read_csv(here::here("data", "fluency_data"))
fluency_data <- read.csv(file)
```

---

178 Our primary outcome variable is the proportion of idea units recalled on the final test, calculated

**Figure 2**

A Bayesian posterior distribution (assuming a uniform prior) centered at a point estimate chosen so that the probability of direction ( $pd$ ) equals 0.95, and a frequentist sampling distribution (under the null; centered at 0). In the Bayesian posterior distribution, the blue area represents the  $pd$ , and the red area represents the remaining  $1 - pd$  of the distribution. In the frequentist sampling distribution, the red tail areas represent the rejection region at  $\alpha = 0.10$ . In this example, the posterior mean lies exactly at the  $1 - \frac{\alpha}{2}$  quantile of the null sampling distribution. For symmetric posteriors with flat priors, the  $pd$  is numerically equivalent to the one-sided  $p$ -value.



**Table 1**

*Four observations from Wilford et al. (2020). Accuracy refers to the proportion of correctly recalled idea units.*

| Participant | Fluency   | Accuracy |
|-------------|-----------|----------|
| 64          | Disfluent | 0.10     |
| 30          | Fluent    | 0.60     |
| 12          | Fluent    | 0.10     |
| 37          | Fluent    | 0.35     |

179 by dividing the number of correct units by 10. We show a sample of these data in Table 1. The dataset  
 180 can be downloaded from GitHub (Listing 1). Because this is a bounded continuous variable (i.e., it ranges  
 181 from 0 to 1), it violates the assumptions of typical linear regression models that treat outcomes as normally  
 182 distributed. Despite this, it remains common in psychological research to analyze proportion data using  
 183 models that assume normality. In what follows, we reproduce Wilford et al. (2020)'s analysis and then  
 184 re-analyze the data using beta regression and highlight how it can improve our inferences.

### 185 **Reanalysis of Wilford et al. Experiment 1A**

186 In their original analysis of Experiment 1A, Wilford et al. (2020) compared memory performance  
 187 between fluent and disfluent instructor conditions using a traditional independent-samples t-test on mean  
 188 accuracy for 96 participants. They found that participants who watched the fluent instructor recalled signifi-  
 189 cantly more idea units than those who viewed the disfluent version (see Figure 3).

190 We first replicate this analysis in a regression framework using {brms}. We model final test mean  
 191 accuracy—the proportion of correctly recalled idea units across the videos—as the dependent variable. Our  
 192 predictor is instructor fluency, with two levels: Fluent and Disfluent. We use treatment (dummy) coding,  
 193 which is the default in R. This coding scheme sets the first level of a factor (in alphabetical order) as the  
 194 reference level. In this case, Disfluent is the reference, and the coefficient for Fluent reflects the contrast  
 195 between fluent and disfluent instructor conditions.

### 196 **Regression Model**

197 We first start by loading the brms (Bürkner, 2017) and cmdstanr (Gabry et al., 2024) packages  
 198 (Listing 2). We use the cmdstanr backend for Stan (Team, 2023) because it's faster than the default used to  
 199 run models (i.e., rstan),<sup>4</sup> though all of these models can also be fit with brms defaults.

---

#### **Listing 2** Load the brms and cmdstanr packages

---

```
library(brms)
library(cmdstanr)
```


---

200 We fit the model using the brm() function from the brms package (Listing 3). Although not shown  
 201 here, we ran the models using four chains (the default), executed in parallel across four cores. When the  
 202 model is run in Listing 3, the model summary output will appear in the R console. The output from

<sup>4</sup>In order to use the cmdstanr backend you will need to first install the package (see <https://mc-stan.org/cmdstanr/>) and also run cmdstanr::install\_cmdstan() if you have not done so already.

**Figure 3**

*Dot plot depicting accuracy distributions for the Fluent and Disfluent conditions. Each condition shows individual data points and summary statistics (mean and 95% percentile interval) to illustrate variability and central tendency.*



203 bayes\_reg\_model shows each parameter's posterior summary: The posterior distribution's mean and standard deviation (analogous to the frequentist standard error) and its 95% credible interval, which indicate the 204 95% of the most credible parameter values. In brms, the reported Cr.I is an equal-tailed interval, meaning 205 that the probability mass excluded from the interval is split equally between the lower and upper tails. Additionally, the output indicates numerical estimates of the sampling algorithm's performance: Rhat should 206 be close to one, and the ESS (effective sample size) metrics should be as large as possible given the number 207 of iterations specified (default is 4000). Generally, ESS  $\geq 1000$  is recommended (Bürkner, 2017). For the 208 models we present in this paper, convergence is trivial with standard linear models, though we note that these 209 metrics are still important to pay attention to in case of model misfit.

210 Our main question of interest is: what is the causal effect of instructor fluency on final test performance? In order to answer this question, we will have to look at the output summary produced by Listing 3 211 (also see Table 8 under Bayesian LM). the Intercept refers to the posterior mean accuracy in the disfluent 212 condition,  $M = 0.257$ , as fluency was dummy-coded. The fluency coefficient (FluencyFluent) reflects the 213 mean posterior difference in recall accuracy between the fluent and disfluent conditions:  $b = 0.085$ . The 95% 214 Cr.I for this estimate spans from 0 to 0.172. These values are shown in the "95% Cr.I" columns of the output. 215 These results closely mirror the findings reported by Wilford et al. (2020) (Experiment 1A).

---

**Listing 3** Fitting a gaussian model with brm().

---

```

bayes_reg_model <- brm(
  Accuracy ~ Fluency,
  data = fluency_data,
  family = gaussian(),
  file = here::here("manuscript", "models", "model_reg_bayes")
)

219 Family: gaussian
220 Links: mu = identity; sigma = identity
221 Formula: Accuracy ~ Fluency
222 Data: fluency_data (Number of observations: 96)
223
224 Regression Coefficients:
225             Estimate Est.Error 1-95% CI u-95% CI Rhat Bulk_ESS Tail_ESS
226 Intercept      0.26     0.03    0.20    0.31 1.00    3893    2990
227 FluencyFluent  0.08     0.04    0.00    0.17 1.00    3674    2537
228
229 Further Distributional Parameters:
230             Estimate Est.Error 1-95% CI u-95% CI Rhat Bulk_ESS Tail_ESS
231 sigma       0.21     0.02    0.18    0.24 1.00    3682    3147

```

232 The output also includes the effective sample size (ESS) and R (R-hat) values, both of which fall  
 233 within acceptable ranges, indicating good model convergence. Throughout the tutorial, we focus primarily  
 234 on posterior mean estimates and their 95% credible intervals. In addition, we report the pd measure in the  
 235 main summary table (Table 8), provided by the {bayestestR} package (Makowski, Ben-Shachar, Chen, et  
 236 al., 2019; Makowski, Ben-Shachar, & Lüdecke, 2019). This measure offers an intuitive parallel to *p*-values,  
 237 which many readers may find familiar. For example, the fluency effect has a pd of .977, indicating a high  
 238 probability that the effect is positive rather than negative (akin to *p* < .05).


239 Importantly, pd does not indicate whether an effect is meaningfully different from a point value—it  
 240 only reflects the proportion of the posterior in one direction. To address questions of practical significance,  
 241 we encourage readers to consider the Region of Practical Equivalence (ROPE) with the Cr.Is (Kruschke,  
 242 2015). Unlike a hypothesis test of a point null (e.g., exactly zero), the ROPE defines a range of values that  
 243 are deemed too small to be of substantive importance. As a rule of thumb (see Kruschke, 2018), if more than  
 244 95% of the posterior distribution lies inside the ROPE, the effect can be considered practically equivalent  
 245 to that negligible range. If less than 5% lies inside, the effect can be considered meaningfully different.  
 246 Intermediate cases are typically labeled undecided.

247 The rope() function in the {bayestestR} package computes the proportion of the posterior within  
 248 the ROPE to facilitate this evaluation. By default, from bayesian models fit via brms the package determines  
 249 a ROPE based on the data (roughly reflecting “negligible” effects), but these defaults should be used cau-  
 250 tiously. The choice of ROPE should ultimately be guided by theoretical considerations, prior research, and  
 251 the substantive context of the study. In ?@lst-rope-brms, we show how to compute this using bayestestR.  
 252 Running the function with default settings suggests that less than 5% of the posterior distribution lies within  
 253 the default ROPE (indicating the effect is larger than .02) (see Figure 4). Going forward we do not include a  
 254 discussion of ROPE values, but we encourage readers to adopt it in their own research when appropriate.

255 Wilford et al. (2020) observed that instructor fluency impacts actual learning, using a standard *t*-test

**Figure 4**

*Posterior distribution for the fluency effect showing the ROPE(shaded area) with 95% credible interval (orange) and 100% credible interval (blue). The percentage indicates the proportion of the posterior within the ROPE.*



256 on the mean accuracy. But recall this approach assumes normality of residuals and homoscedacity. These  
 257 assumptions are unrealistic when the response values approach the scale boundaries (Sladekova & Field,  
 258 2024). Does the data we have meet those assumptions? We can use the function `check_model()` from  
 259 `{easystats}` (Lüdecke et al., 2022) to check our assumptions easily. The code in Listing 4 automatically  
 260 produces Figure 5. We can see some issues with our data. Specifically, there appears to be violations of  
 261 constant variance across the values of the scale (homoskedasticity). In plain terms, this type of model mis-  
 262 specification means that a standard OLS model can predict non-sensical values outside the bounds of the  
 263 scale.

---

**Listing 4** Checking assumptions with the `check_model()` from `easystats` package .


---

```
check_model(bayes_reg_model, check = c("homogeneity", "qq"))
```

---

**Figure 5**

*Two assumption checks for our OLS model: Normality (right) and Homoskedasticity (left)*



264 We can also examine how well the data fits the model by performing a posterior predictive check  
 265 using the `pp_check()` function from `{brms}`. A posterior predictive check involves looking at multiple  
 266 draws or repetitions from the posterior distribution and plotting it against the observed data. Ideally, the  
 267 predictive draws (the light blue lines) should show reasonable resemblance with the observed data (dark blue  
 268 line). In our example (see Figure 12 (A)) the model-predicted density is slightly too peaked and narrow  
 269 compared to the data. In addition, some of the draws extend into negative accuracy values.

## 270 Distributional Regression - Beta Regression

271 It is important to note that there are several justifiable approaches for addressing the distributional  
 272 issues observed in the data. For instance, one could analyze median accuracy instead of the mean, use some  
 273 type of robust estimator for heterogeneity, or apply non-parametric methods to relax some of the model as-  
 274 sumptions. However, in a Bayesian framework, we can address these issues more directly and transparently  
 275 by fitting distributional models (Kneib et al., 2023; Kruschke, 2013). A key advantage of Bayesian distribu-  
 276 tional modeling approach is that we are not limited to modeling only the mean or median of the outcome;  
 277 we can also model parameters such as the variance (or other shape parameters) as functions of predictors.  
 278 This allows us to examine how instructor fluency may influence not only average performance, but also the  
 279 variability in performance across students. If we wanted to keep our mean accuracy variable and continue to  
 280 use a Gaussian model, we could use a distributional approach and model the effect of fluency on  $\sigma$ .

Given the outcome variable is proportional, another solution would be to run a beta regression model. Again, we can create the beta regression model in `brms`. In `brms`, we model each parameter independently. Recall from the introduction that in a beta model we model two parameters— $\mu$  and  $\phi$ . Again we do this by using the `bf()` function from `brms` (Listing 5). We fit two formulas, one for  $\mu$  and one for  $\phi$  and store it in the `model_beta_bayes` object below. In the below `bf()` call, we are modeling Fluency as a function of Accuracy only for the  $\mu$  parameter. For the  $\phi$  parameter, we are only modeling the intercept value. This is saying dispersion does not change as a function of fluency.

To run our beta regression model, we need to exclude 0s and 1s in our data set. If we try to run a model with our data `data_fluency` we get an error: `Error: Family 'beta' requires response greater than 0.` This is because the beta distribution only supports observations in the 0 to 1 interval *excluding exact 0s and 1s*. We need make sure there are no 0s and 1s in our dataset.

The dataset contains nine 0s and one 1. One approach is to nudge our 0s towards .01 and our 1s to .99, or apply a special formula (Smithson & Verkuilen, 2006) so values fall within the [0, 1] interval. We implore readers not to engage in this practice. Kubinec (2022) showed that this practice can result in serious distortion of the outcome as the sample size grows larger, resulting in ever smaller values that are “nudged”. Because the beta distribution is a non-linear model of the outcome, values that are very close to the boundary, such as 0.00001 or 0.99999, will be highly influential outliers. To run this beta model we will remove the 0s and 1s, and later in this article we will show how to jointly model these scale end points with the rest of the data. The model from Listing 5 uses a transformed `data_fluency` object (called `data_beta`) where 0s and 1s are removed. When we run this code we should not get an error.

---

**Listing 5** Fitting a beta model without 0s and 1s in `brm()`.

---

```
# set up model formual
model_beta_bayes <- bf(
  Accuracy ~ Fluency, # fit mu model
  phi ~ 1 # fit phi model
)

# transform 0 to 0.1 and 1 to .99
data_beta <- fluency_data |>
  filter(
    Accuracy != 0,
    Accuracy != 1
  )

beta_brms <- brm(
  model_beta_bayes,
  data = data_beta,
  family = Beta(),
  file = here::here("manuscript", "models", "model_beta_bayes_reg_01")
)
```

---

**Model Parameters.** In Table 8, under the beta regression column, the coefficient with `b_` represents how fluency of instructor influences the  $\mu$  parameter estimates (which is the mean of the distribution here). These coefficients are interpreted on the scale of the logit, meaning they represent linear changes on a non-linear space. The intercept term (`b_Intercept`) represents the log odds of the mean on accuracy for the

305 fluent instructor. Log odds that are negative indicate that it is more likely a “success” (like getting the correct  
 306 answer) will NOT happen than that it will happen. Similarly, regression coefficients in log odds forms that  
 307 are negative indicate that an increase in that predictor leads to a decrease in the predicted probability of a  
 308 “success”.

309       The other component we need to pay attention to is the dispersion or precision parameter coefficients  
 310 labeled as phi in Table 8. The dispersion ( $\phi$ ) parameter tells us how precise our estimate is. Specifically,  
 311  $\phi$  in beta regression tells us about the variability of the response variable around its mean. Specifically, a  
 312 higher dispersion parameter indicates a narrower distribution, reflecting less variability. Conversely, a lower  
 313 dispersion parameter suggests a wider distribution, reflecting greater variability. The main difference between  
 314 a dispersion parameter and the variance is that the dispersion has a different interpretation depending on the  
 315 value of the outcome, as we show below. The best way to understand dispersion is to examine visual changes  
 316 in the distribution as the dispersion increases or decreases.

317       Understanding the dispersion parameter helps us gauge the precision of our predictions and the con-  
 318 sistency of the response variable. In `beta_brms` we only modeled the dispersion of the intercept. When  
 319  $\phi$  is not specified, the intercept is modeled by default (see Table 8). It represents the overall dispersion in  
 320 the outcome across all conditions. Instead, we can model different dispersions across levels of the Fluency  
 321 factor. To do so, we add Fluency to the phi model in `bf()`. We model the precision (phi) of the Fluency  
 322 factor by using a ~ and adding factors of interest to the right of it (Listing 6).

---

**Listing 6** Fitting beta model with dispersion in `brm()`.

---

```
model_beta_bayes_disp <- bf(
  Accuracy ~ Fluency, # Model of the mean
  phi ~ Fluency # Model of the precision
)

beta_brms_dis <- brm(
  model_beta_bayes_disp,
  data = data_beta,
  family = Beta(),
  file = here::here("manuscript", "models", "model_beta_bayes_dis_run01")
)
```

---

323       Table 8 displays the model summary with the precision parameter labeled as `phi_Fluency`. Since  $\phi$   
 324 is modeled on the log scale, the coefficients represent changes in  $\log-\phi$  rather than  $\phi$  itself. To see the effect  
 325 in the original units, we convert the values back by exponentiating. Thus, the effect of the Fluent condition  
 326 can be understood by comparing the exponentiated predicted  $\phi$  in the Fluent condition to that in the baseline  
 327 condition.

328       The  $\phi$  parameters are estimated on the log scale. The term  $\beta_{\text{Intercept}}^{(\phi)}$  represents the log-precision for  
 329 the reference (disfluent) condition. The coefficient  $\beta_{\text{FluencyFluent}}^{(\phi)}$  represents the change in log-precision when  
 330 moving from the disfluent to the fluent condition.

331       To obtain precision on the original scale, we exponentiate the linear predictor:

$$\phi_{\text{disfluent}} = \exp(\beta_{\text{Intercept}}^{(\phi)}), \quad \phi_{\text{fluent}} = \exp(\beta_{\text{Intercept}}^{(\phi)} + \beta_{\text{FluencyFluent}}^{(\phi)}).$$

332       The coefficient  $\beta_{\text{FluencyFluent}}^{(\phi)}$  therefore describes a *multiplicative* change in precision. Specifically,

$$\frac{\phi_{\text{fluent}}}{\phi_{\text{disfluent}}} = \exp(\beta_{\text{FluencyFluent}}^{(\phi)}).$$

Because the 95% credible interval for  $\beta_{\text{FluencyFluent}}^{(\phi)}$  does not include zero, we infer that there is a credible difference in precision between the fluent and disfluent conditions.

It is important to note that these estimates are not the same as the marginal effects we discussed earlier. Changes in dispersion affect the spread or variability of the response distribution without necessarily altering its mean. This makes dispersion particularly relevant for research questions that focus on features of the distribution beyond the average—such as how concentrated responses are. For instance, high dispersion might indicate that individuals cluster at the extremes (e.g., very high or very low ratings), suggesting clustering in the outcome.

A critical assumption of the linear model is homoscedasticity, which means constant variance of the errors. WIth beta regression model we can include a dispersion parameter for Fluency. Properly accounting for dispersion is crucial because it impacts the precision of our mean estimates and, consequently, the significance of our coefficients. The inclusion of dispersion in the our model increased the uncertainty of the  $\mu$  coefficient (see Figure 6). This suggests that failing to account for the dispersion of the variables might lead to biased estimates. This highlights the potential utility of an approach like beta regression over a traditional approach as beta regression can explicitly model dispersion and address issues of heteroscedasticity.

While it is advisable to model precision, if there is uncertainty about the best model, a relatively agnostic approach would be to compare models, for example with leave one out (loo) cross validation, to examine if a dispersion parameter should be considered in our model.<sup>5</sup>

### **Predicted Probabilities**

Parameter estimates are usually difficult to interpret on their own and can require a lot of mathematical gymnastics to get the estimate you need. We argue that researchers should not spend too much time interpreting raw coefficients from non-linear models. We report them in this tutorial for completeness. Instead researchers should discuss the effects of the predictor on the actual outcome of interest (in this case the 0-1 scale). The logit link allows us to transform back and forth between the scale of a linear model and the nonlinear scale of the outcome, which is bounded by 0 and 1. By using the inverse of the logit, we can easily transform our linear coefficients to obtain average effects on the scale of the proportions or percentages, which is usually what is interesting to applied researchers. In a simple case, we can do this manually, but when there are many factors in your model this can be quite complex.

In our example, we can use the `plogis()` function in base R to convert estimates from the logit scale to the probability scale. The intercept of our model is -0.918, which reflects the logit of the mean accuracy in the disfluent condition. If the estimated difference between the fluent and disfluent conditions is 0.24 on the logit scale, we first add this value to the intercept value (-0.918) to get the logit for the fluent condition:  $-0.83 + 0.20 = -0.63$ . We then use `plogis()` to convert both logit values to probabilities (Fluent = 35%, Disfluent = 30%).

This is pretty easy to do manually, but when your model has many predictors, it can be quite cumbersome. To help us extract predictions from our model and visualize them we will use a package called `{marginaleffects}` (Arel-Bundock et al., 2024) (see Listing 7). To get the proportions for each of our categorical predictors on the  $\mu$  parameter we can use the function from the package called `predictions()`. These are displayed in Table 2. These probabilities match what we calculated above.


For the Fluency factor, we can interpret Mean as proportions or percentages. That is, participants who watched the fluent instructor scored on average 35% on the final exam compared to 30% for

---

<sup>5</sup>The model fit statistic LOO-CV can be compared for any set of fitted `brms` models with the function `loo()`.

**Figure 6**

*Comparison of posterior distributions for the risk difference in fluency: Simple model (no dispersion for Fluency) vs. complex model with dispersion*

**Table 2**

*Predicted probabilities for fluency factor.*

| Fluency   | Mean  | 95% Cr.I       |
|-----------|-------|----------------|
| Disfluent | 0.297 | [0.249, 0.348] |
| Fluent    | 0.353 | [0.302, 0.408] |

---

**Listing 7** Load the {marginaleffects} package.

```
library(marginaleffects)
options(marginaleffects_posterior_center = mean) # make sure returns mean
```

---

**Listing 8** Predictions from the beta model for each level of Fluency.

```
predictions(
  beta_brms,
  # need to specify the levels of the categorical predictor
  newdata = datagrid(Fluency = c("Disfluent", "Fluent"))
)
```

---

374 those who watched the disfluent instructor. We can also visualize these from {marginaleffects} using the  
375 plot\_predictions() function (see Listing 9).

---

**Listing 9** Plot predicted probabilities using plot\_predictions() from {marginaleffects}

```
beta_plot <- plot_predictions(beta_brms, by = "Fluency")
```

---

376 The plot\_predictions() function will only display the point estimate with the 95% credible inter-  
377 val. However, Bayesian estimation methods generate distributions for each parameter. This approach allows  
378 visualizing full uncertainty estimates beyond points and intervals. Using the {marginaleffects} package, we  
379 can obtain samples from the posterior distribution with the posterior\_draws() function (see Listing 10).  
380 We can then plot these results to illustrate the range of plausible values for our estimates at different levels  
381 of uncertainty (see Figure 7).

---

**Listing 10** Extracting posterior draws from the beta regression model.

```
# Add a model identifier to each dataset
pred_draws_beta <- avg_predictions(beta_brms, variables = "Fluency") |>
  posterior_draws()
```

---




---

**382 Marginal Effects**

383 Marginal effects offer an interpretable way to quantify how changes in a predictor influence an out-  
384 come, while holding other factors constant in a specific manner. **In recent years, there has been a thrust to**  
385 **move away from reporting regression coefficients alone, focusing instead on estimates that are easier to**  
386 **interpret and communicate—particularly in non-linear models (McCabe et al., 2021; Rohrer & Arel-**  
387 **Bundock, 2025).** Technically, marginal effects are computed as partial derivatives for continuous variables  
388 or as finite differences for categorical (and sometimes continuous) predictors, depending on the structure  
389 of the data and the research question. Substantively, these procedures translate raw regression coefficients  
390 into quantities that reflect changes in the bounded outcome—for example, an  $x\%$  change in the value of a  
391 proportion.

**Figure 7**

*Predicted probability posterior distributions by fluency*

**Table 3**

*Fluency difference*

392 There are various types of marginal effects, and their calculation can vary across software packages.

393 For example, the popular `{emmeans}` package (Lenth, 2025) computes marginal effects by holding all pre-  
394 dictors at their means (MEM). In this tutorial, we will use the `{marginaleffects}` package (Arel-Bundock et  
395 al., 2024), which focuses on average marginal effects (AMEs) by default. AMEs summarize effects by gen-  
396 erating predictions for each row of the original dataset and then averaging these predictions. This approach  
397 retains a strong connection to the original data while offering a straightforward summary of the effect of  
398 interest.

399 One practical use of AMEs is to estimate the average difference between two groups or conditions

400 which corresponds to the average treatment effect (ATE). Using the `avg_comparisons()` function in the  
401 `{marginaleffects}` package (Listing 11), we can compute this quantity directly. By default, the function returns  
402 the discrete difference between groups. When we take the difference in proportions between two groups it  
403 is called the risk difference. Depending on the audience and modeling goals, the function can also produce  
404 alternative effect size metrics, such as odds ratios or risk ratios. This flexibility makes it a powerful approach  
405 for summarizing and communicating regression results.

---

**Listing 11** Calculating the difference between probabilities with `avg_comparisons()`

---

```
# get risk difference by default
beta_avg_comp <- avg_comparisons(beta_brms, comparison = "difference")
```

---

406       Table 3 presents the estimated difference for the Fluency factor (Mean column). The difference  
 407      between the fluent and disfluent conditions is 0.06, indicating that participants who watched a fluent instructor  
 408      scored, on average, 6% higher on the final recall test than those who watched a disfluent instructor. However,  
 409      the 95% credible interval includes 0 among the most credible values, suggesting we cannot rule out the  
 410      possibility of a null or weakly negative effect.

411       We can also use `{marginaleffects}` to get the actual precision difference between the two groups on  
 412       $\phi$  using similar code to above by setting `dpar` to “phi” {Listing 12}.

---

**Listing 12** Calculating  $\phi$  difference with `avg_comparisons()`

---

```
# get risk difference by default

beta_avg_phi <- avg_comparisons(
  beta_brms_dis,
  dpar = "phi",
  comparison = "difference"
)
```

---

413       In psychology, it is common to report effect size measures like Cohen’s  $d$  (Cohen, 1977). When  
 414      working with proportions we can calculate something similar called Cohen’s  $h$ . Taking our proportions, we  
 415      can use the below equation (Equation 2) to calculate Cohen’s  $h$  along with the 95% Cr.I around it. Using this  
 416      metric we see the effect size is small (0.107), 95% credible interval [-0.002, 0.361].

$$h = 2 \cdot (\arcsin(\sqrt{p_1}) - \arcsin(\sqrt{p_2})) \quad (2)$$

417       **Posterior Predictive Check**

418       Figure 12 (B) shows the predictive check for our beta model. The model does a pretty good job  
 419      at capturing the data (The draws are now between 0-1) and the predicted values from the model follow the  
 420      observed data. However, it could be better.

421       **Zero-Inflated beta (ZIB) Regression**

422       A limitation of the beta regression model is that it can only accommodate values strictly between 0  
 423      and 1—it cannot handle values exactly equal to 0 or 1. In our dataset, we observed 9 rows where Accuracy  
 424      equals zero. To fit a beta regression model, we removed these values, but we have left out potentially valuable  
 425      information from our model—especially if the end points of the scale are distinctive in some way. In our case,  
 426      these 0s may be structural—that is, they represent real, systematic instances where participants failed to  
 427      answer correctly (rather than random noise or measurement error). For example, the fluency of the instructor  
 428      might be a key factor in predicting these zero responses. We will discuss two approaches for jointly modeling  
 429      these end points with the continuous data. First, we can use a zero-inflated beta (ZIB) model. This model

430 still estimates the mean ( $\mu$ ) and precision ( $\phi$ ) of the beta distribution for values between 0 and 1, but it also  
 431 includes an additional parameter,  $\alpha$ , which captures the probability of observing structural 0s.

432 The zero-inflated beta models a mixture of the data-generating process. The  $\alpha$  parameter uses a  
 433 logistic regression to model whether the data is 0 or not. Substantively, this could be a useful model when we  
 434 think that 0s come from a process that is relatively distinct from the data that is greater than 0. For example,  
 435 if we had a dataset with proportion of looks or eye fixations to certain areas on marketing materials, we might  
 436 want a separate model for those that do not look at certain areas on the screen because individuals who do  
 437 not look might be substantively different than those that look.

438 We can fit a ZIB model using `brms()` and use the `{marginaleffects}` package to make inferences  
 439 about our parameters of interest. Before we run a zero-inflated beta model, we will need to transform our  
 440 data again and remove the one 1 value in our data—we can keep our 0s. Similar to our beta regression model  
 441 we fit in `brms`, we will use the `bf()` function to fit several models. We fit our  $\mu$  and  $\phi$  parameters as well as  
 442 our zero-inflated parameter ( $\alpha$ ; here labeled as `zi`). In `brms` we can use the `zero_inflated_beta` family (see  
 443 Listing 13).

---

### **Listing 13** Fitting zib model with `brm()`

---

```
# keep 0 but remove 1
data_beta_0 <- fluency_data |>
  filter(Accuracy != 1)

# set up model formula for zero-inflated beta in brm
zib_model <- bf(
  Accuracy ~ Fluency, # The mean of the 0-1 values, or mu
  phi ~ Fluency, # The precision of the 0-1 values, or phi
  zi ~ Fluency, # The zero-or-one-inflated part, or alpha
  family = zero_inflated_beta()
)

# fit zib model with brm
fit_zi <- brm(
  formula = zib_model,
  data = data_beta_0,
  file = here::here("manuscript", "models", "bayes_zib_model0not1.rds")
)
```

---

#### **444 Posterior Predictive Check**

445 The ZIB model does a bit better at capturing the structure of the data than the beta regression model  
 446 (see Figure 12). Specifically, the ZIB model more accurately captures the increased density of values near  
 447 the lower end of the scale (i.e., near zero), which the standard beta model underestimates. The ZIB model's  
 448 predictive distributions also align more closely with the observed data across the entire range, particularly in  
 449 the peak and tail regions. This improved fit likely reflects the ZIB model's ability to explicitly model excess  
 450 0s (or near-zero values) via its inflation component, allowing it to better account for features in the data that  
 451 a standard beta distribution cannot accommodate.

**Table 4***Probability fluency difference ( $\mu$ )*

| Contrast           | Mean  | 95% Cr.I        | pd    |
|--------------------|-------|-----------------|-------|
| Fluent - Disfluent | 0.044 | [-0.029, 0.113] | 0.885 |

**Table 5***Probability fluency difference ( $\phi$ )*

| Contrast           | Mean | 95% Cr.I        | pd    |
|--------------------|------|-----------------|-------|
| Fluent - Disfluent | 2.74 | [-0.766, 6.685] | 0.938 |

452 **Predicted Probabilities and Marginal Effects**

453       Table 8, under the zero-inflated beta regression column, provides a summary of the posterior distribution  
 454 for each parameter. As stated before, it is preferable to back-transform our estimates to get probabilities.  
 455 To get the predicted probabilities we can again use the `avg_predictions()` and `avg_comparisons()`  
 456 functions from `{marginaleffects}` package (Arel-Bundock, 2024) to get predicted probabilities and the prob-  
 457 ability difference between the levels of each factor. We can model the parameters separately using the `dpar`  
 458 argument setting to:  $\mu$ ,  $\phi$ ,  $\alpha$ . Here we look at the risk difference for Fluency under each parameter. If one  
 459 were interested in the average effect for the entire model, the `dpar` argument could be removed.

460       **Mu.** As shown in Table 4, there is little evidence for an effect of Fluency – the 95% Cr.I includes  
 461 zero, suggesting substantial uncertainty about the direction and magnitude of the effect—that is, though most  
 462 of the posterior density supports positive effects, nil and weakly negative effects cannot be ruled out.

463       **Dispersion.** As shown in Table 5, the posterior estimates suggest a credible effect of Fluency on  
 464 dispersion ( $\phi$ ), with disfluent responses showing greater variability. The 95% Cr.I for the fluency contrast  
 465 does not include zero, indicating a high probability in differences in precision.

466 **Zero-Inflation**

467       We can use `{marginaleffects}` to estimate and plot the posterior difference between the fluent and  
 468 disfluent conditions (see Figure 8). In Figure 8, the posterior distribution for this contrast lies mostly below  
 469 zero, indicating that a fluent instructor is associated with a lower probability of zero responses. The estimated  
 470 reduction is approximately 13%. The 95% credible interval does not include zero, which indicates that the  
 471 data provide consistent evidence for a reduction in zero responses under fluent instruction.


472 **Zero-One-Inflated beta (ZOIB)**

473       The ZIB model works well if you have 0s in your data, but not 1s.<sup>6</sup> In our previous examples we  
 474 either got rid of both 0s and 1s (beta regression), or removed the 1s (ZIB). Sometimes it is theoretically useful  
 475 to model both 0s and 1s as separate processes or to consider these values as essentially similar parts of the  
 476 continuous response, as we show later in the ordered beta regression model. For example, this is important  
 477 in visual analog scale data where there might be a prevalence of responses at the bounds (Kong & Edwards,

<sup>6</sup>In cases where your data include exact 1s but no 0s, you can fit a one-inflated beta regression model in `brms` by setting the `coi` parameter to 1. This tells the model that all point masses occur at 1, rather than being split between 0 and 1. In other words, `coi = 1` assumes that any inflation in the data is due entirely to values at 1. In our data, we have exactly one value equal to 1<sup>[^6]</sup>. While probably not significant to alter our findings, we can model 1s with a special type of model called the zero-one-inflated beta (ZOIB) model (Liu & Kong, 2015) if we believe that both 0s and 1s are distinct outcomes.

**Figure 8**

*Visualization of the predicted difference for zero-inflated part of model*



478 2016), in JOL tasks (Wilford et al., 2020), or in a free-list task where individuals provide open responses to  
 479 some question or topic which are then recoded to fall between 0-1 (Bendixen & Purzycki, 2023). Here 0s  
 480 and 1s are meaningful; 0 means item was not listed and 1 means the item was listed first.


481 Similar to the beta and zero-inflated models discussed above, we can fit a zero-and-one-inflated beta  
 482 (ZOIB) model in `{brms}` using the `zero_one_inflated_beta` family. This formulation simultaneously  
 483 estimates the mean  $\mu$  and precision  $\phi$  of the Beta component, as well as two inflation parameters:  $\alpha$ , the  
 484 probability that an observation is at either boundary (0 or 1), and  $\gamma$ , the conditional probability that, given  
 485 an observation falls on a boundary, it takes the value 1 rather than 0. In other words,  $\alpha$  determines how often  
 486 responses occur exactly at the endpoints, and  $\gamma$  determines the balance between zeros and ones among those  
 487 endpoint values. This specification allows the model to capture both the continuous variation in the interior  
 488 of the (0, 1) interval and the presence of exact boundary values.

489 To illustrate how  $\alpha$  and  $\gamma$  shape the distribution, Figure 9 displays simulated data across a range  
 490 of parameter combinations. As  $\alpha$  increases, more responses occur at the endpoints. As  $\gamma$  increases, the  
 491 proportion of those endpoint responses that are 1 increases relative to 0, producing increasingly pronounced  
 492 spikes at 1 as  $\gamma$  approaches 1. Together, these parameters give the ZOIB model the flexibility to represent  
 493 datasets with mixtures of continuous values and exact zeros and ones.

494 To fit a ZOIB model we use the `bf()` function. We model each parameter as a function of Fluency.  
 495 We then pass the `zoib_model` to our `brm()` function (see Listing 14). The summary of the output is in

**Figure 9**

*Simulated data from a ZOIB model illustrating the effects of the zero-one inflation parameter ( $\alpha$ ) and the conditional one-inflation parameter ( $\gamma$ ).*



496 Table 8 (under ZOIB).

497 **Model Parameters**

498 The output for the model is lengthy because we are estimating four distinct components, each with  
 499 their own independent responses and sub-models. All the coefficients are on the logit scale, except  $\phi$ , which is  
 500 on the log scale. Thankfully drawing inferences for all these different parameters, plotting their distributions,  
 501 and estimating their average marginal effects looks exactly the same—all the brms and {marginaleffects}  
 502 functions we used work the same.

503 **Predictions and Marginal Effects**

504 With {marginaleffects} we can choose marginalize over all the sub-models, averaged across the 0s,  
 505 continuous responses, and 1s in the data, or we can model the parameters separately using the dpar argument  
 506 like we did above setting it to:  $\mu$ ,  $\phi$ ,  $\alpha$ ,  $\gamma$  (see below). Using avg\_predictions() and not setting dpar we  
 507 can get the predicted probabilities across all the sub-models. We can also plot the overall difference between

---

**Listing 14** Fitting a ZOIB model with `brm()`.

```
# fit the zoib model

zoib_model <- bf(
  Accuracy ~ Fluency, # The mean of the 0-1 values, or mu
  phi ~ Fluency, # The precision of the 0-1 values, or phi
  zoi ~ Fluency, # The zero-or-one-inflated part, or alpha
  coi ~ Fluency, # The one-inflated part, conditional on the 1s, or gamma
  family = zero_one_inflated_beta()
)

fit_zoib <- brm(
  formula = zoib_model,
  data = fluency_data,
  file = here::here("manuscript", "models", "bayes_zoib_model")
)
```

---

508 fluency and disfluency for the whole model with `plot_predictions()`.

509 In addition, we show below how one can extract the predicted probabilities and marginal effects for  
510  $\gamma$  (and a similar process for any other model component, `zoi`, etc.):

---

**Listing 15** Extracting predicted probabilities and marginal effects for conditional-one parameter

```
# get average predictions for coi param
coi_probs <- avg_predictions(fit_zoib, by = c("Fluency"), dpar = "coi")
# get difference between the two conditions
coi_me <- avg_comparisons(fit_zoib, variables = c("Fluency"), dpar = "coi")
```

---

511 **Ordered Beta Regression**

512 Looking at the output from the ZOIB model (Table 8), we can see how running a model like this  
513 can become fairly complex as it is fitting distinct sub-models for each component of the scale. The ability  
514 to consider 0s and 1s as distinct processes from continuous values comes at a price in terms of complexity  
515 and interpretability. A simplified version of the zero-one-inflated beta (ZOIB) model, known as ordered  
516 beta regression (Kubinec, 2022; see also Makowski et al., 2025 for a reparameterized version called the  
517 *beta-Gate* model), has been recently proposed. The ordered beta regression model exploits the fact that,  
518 for most analyses, the continuous values (between 0-1) and the discrete outcomes (e.g., 0 or 1) are *ordered*.  
519 For example, as a covariate  $x$  increases or decreases, we should expect the bounded outcome  $y$  to increase  
520 or decrease monotonically as well from 0 to (0, 1) to 1. The ZOIB model does not impose this restriction;  
521 a covariate could increase and the response  $y$  could increase in its continuous values while *simultaneously*  
522 decreasing at *both* end points.<sup>7</sup> This complexity is not immediately obvious when fitting the ZOIB, nor is  
523 it a potential relationship that many scholars want to consider when examining how covariates influence a  
524 bounded scale.

---

<sup>7</sup>For a more complete description of this issue, we refer the reader to Kubinec (2022).

525 To make the response ordered, the ordered beta regression model estimates a weighted combination  
 526 of a standard beta regression model for continuous responses and a logit model for the discrete values of  
 527 the response. By doing so, the amount of distinctiveness between the continuous responses and the discrete  
 528 end points is a function of the data (and any informative priors) rather than strictly defined as fully distinct  
 529 processes as in the ZOIB. For some datasets, the continuous and discrete responses will be fairly distinct,  
 530 and in others less so.

531 The weights that average together the two parts of the outcome (i.e., discrete and continuous) are  
 532 determined by cutpoints that are estimated in conjunction with the data in a similar manner to what is known  
 533 as an ordered logit model. An in-depth explanation of ordinal regression is beyond the scope of this tutorial  
 534 (Bürkner & Vuorre, 2019; but see Fullerton & Anderson, 2021). At a basic level, ordinal regression models  
 535 are useful for outcome variables that are categorical in nature and have some inherent ordering (e.g., Likert  
 536 scale items). To preserve this ordering, ordinal models rely on the cumulative probability distribution.  
 537 Within an ordinal regression model it is assumed that there is a continuous but unobserved latent variable  
 538 that determines which of  $k$  ordinal responses will be selected. For example on a typical Likert scale from  
 539 ‘Strongly Disagree’ to ‘Strongly Agree’, you could assume that there is a continuous, unobserved variable  
 540 called ‘Agreement’.

541 While we cannot measure Agreement directly, the ordinal response gives us some indication about  
 542 where participants are on the continuous Agreement scale.  $k - 1$  cutoffs are then estimated to indicate the  
 543 point on the continuous Agreement scale at which your Agreement level is high enough to push you into the  
 544 next ordinal category (say Agree to Strongly Agree). Coefficients in the model estimate how much differ-  
 545 ent predictors change the estimated *continuous* scale (here, Agreement). Since there’s only one underlying  
 546 process, there’s only one set of coefficients to work with (proportional odds assumption). In an ordered beta  
 547 regression, three ordered categories are modeled: (1) exactly zero, (2) somewhere between zero and one,  
 548 and (3) exactly one. In an ordered beta regression, (1) and (2) are modeled with cumulative logits, where  
 549 one cutpoint is the the boundary between Exactly 0 and Between 0 and 1 and the other cutpoint is the bound-  
 550 ary between *Between 0 and 1* and *Exactly 1*. The continuous values in the middle, 0 to 1 (3), are modeled  
 551 as a vanilla beta regression with parameters reflecting the mean response on the logit scale as we have de-  
 552 scribed previously. Ultimately, employing cutpoints allows for a smooth transition between the bounds and  
 553 the continuous values, permitting both to be considered together rather than modeled separately as the ZOIB  
 554 requires.

555 The ordered beta regression model has shown to be more efficient and less biased than some of the  
 556 methods discussed (Kubinec, 2022) herein and has seen increasing use across the biomedical and social  
 557 sciences (Martin et al., 2024; Nouvian et al., 2023; Shrestha et al., 2024; Smith et al., 2024; Wilkes et al.,  
 558 2024) because it produces only a single set of coefficient estimates in a similar manner to a standard beta  
 559 regression or OLS.<sup>8</sup>

## 560 ***Fitting an Ordered Beta Regression***

561 To fit an ordered beta regression in a Bayesian context we use the `{ordbetareg}` (Kubinec, 2023) pack-  
 562 age. `{ordbetareg}` is a front-end to the `brms` package that we described earlier; in addition to the functions  
 563 available in the package, most `brms` functions and plots, including the diverse array of regression model-  
 564 ing options, will work with `{ordbetareg}` models. (We note that the `ordbeta` model is also available as a  
 565 maximum-likelihood variant in the R package `{glmmTMB}`.) We first load the `{ordbetareg}` package (see  
 566 Listing 16).

567 The `{ordbetareg}` package uses `brms` on the front-end so all the arguments we used previously apply  
 568 here. Instead of the `brm()` function we use `ordbetareg()`. To fit a model where dispersion does not vary

---

<sup>8</sup>Please note that there are other models available that can model this continuous process like the beta-gate model (Makowski et al., 2025) and the censored extended beta regression model (Kosmidis & Zeileis, 2025).

---

**Listing 16** Load {ordbetareg}

```
library(ordbetareg)
```

---

**Table 6***Marginal effect of fluency ordered beta model*

| Contrast           | Mean  | 95% Cr.I        | pd    |
|--------------------|-------|-----------------|-------|
| Fluent - Disfluent | 0.061 | [-0.015, 0.135] | 0.949 |

---

569 as a function of fluency we can use the below code (see Listing 17).

---

**Listing 17** Fitting ordered beta model with ordbetareg()

```
ord_fit_brms <- ordbetareg(
  Accuracy ~ Fluency,
  data = fluency_data,
  file = here::here("manuscript", "models", "bayes_ordbeta_model")
)
```

---

570 However, if we want dispersion to vary as a function of fluency we can easily do that (see Listing 18).  
 571 Note the addition of the `phi_reg` argument in `m.phi`. This argument allows us to include a model that  
 572 explicitly models the dispersion parameter. Because we are modeling  $\phi$  as a function of fluency, we set the  
 573 the argument to `both`.

---

**Listing 18** Fitting ordered beta model with dispersion using ordbetareg()

```
ord_beta_phi <- bf(Accuracy ~ Fluency, phi ~ Fluency)

m.phi <- ordbetareg(
  ord_beta_phi,
  data = fluency_data,
  phi_reg = 'both',
  file = here::here("manuscript", "models", "bayes_ordbeta_phi_model")
)
```

---

574 **Marginal Effects.** Table 8 presents the posterior summary. We can use `{marginaleffects}` to calculate differences on the response scale that average over (or marginalize over) all our parameters.

576 In Table 6 the credible interval is close enough to zero relative to its uncertainty that we can conclude  
 577 there likely aren't differences between the conditions after taking dispersion and the 0s and 1s in our data  
 578 into account.

579 **Cutpoints.** The model cutpoints are not reported by default in the summary output, but we can  
 580 access them with the R package `posterior` (Bürkner et al., 2025) and the functions `as_draws` and  
 581 `summary_draws`.

**Table 7**

*Cutzero and cutone parameter summary*

| Parameter | Mean  | 95% Cr.I       |
|-----------|-------|----------------|
| cutzero   | -2.98 | [-3.59, -2.43] |
| cutone    | 1.85  | [1.64, 2.07]   |

In Table 7, `cutzero` is the first cutpoint (the difference between 0 and continuous values) and `cutone` is the second cutpoint (the difference between the continuous values and 1). These cutpoints are on the logit scale and as such the numbers do not have a simple substantive meaning. In general, as the cutpoints increase in absolute value (away from zero), then the discrete/boundary observations are more distinct from the continuous values. This will happen if there is a clear gap or bunching in the outcome around the bounds. This type of empirical feature of the distribution may be useful to scholars if they want to study differences in how people perceive the ends of the scale versus the middle. It is possible, though beyond the scope of this article, to model the location of the cutpoints with hierarchical (non-linear) covariates in `brms`. In the most recent version of `ordbeta`, you can test the influence of different factors on these boundaries.

### 591 **Model Fit**

The best way to visualize model fit is to plot the full predictive distribution relative to the original outcome. Because ordered beta regression is a mixed discrete/continuous model, a separate plotting function, `pp_check_ordbetareg`, is included in the `{ordbetareg}` package that accurately handles the unique features of this distribution. The default plot in `brms` will collapse these two features of the outcome together, which will make the fit look worse than it actually is. The `{ordbetareg}` function returns a list with two plots, `discrete` and `continuous`, which can either be printed and plotted or further modified as `{ggplot2}` objects (see Figure 10).

The discrete plot, which is a bar graph, shows that the posterior distribution accurately captures the number of different types of responses (discrete or continuous) in the data. For the continuous plot shown as a density plot with one line per posterior draw, the model does a very good job at capturing the distribution.

Overall, it is clear from the posterior distribution plot that the ordered beta model fits the data well. To fully understand model fit, both of these plots need to be inspected as they are conceptually distinct.

### 604 **Model Visualization**

`{ordbetareg}` provides a neat visualization function called `plot_heiss()` (Ye & Heiss, 2023) that can represent dispersion in the entire outcome as a function of discrete covariates. This function produces a plot of predicted proportions across the range of our Fluency factor. In Figure 11 we get predicted proportions for Fluency across the bounded scale. Looking at the figure we can see there is much overlap between instructors in the middle portion ( $\mu$ ). However, we do see some small differences at the zero bounds.

### 610 **Ordered Beta Scale**

In the `{ordbetareg}` function there is a `true_bound` argument. In cases where your data is not bounded between 0-1, you can use this argument to specify the bounds of the argument to fit the ordered beta regression. For example, you data might be bounded between 1 and 7. If so, you can model it as such and `{ordbetareg}` will convert the model predictions back to the true bounds after estimation.


**Table 8***Bayesian regression summaries for each model*

| Parameter       | Stat | Bayesian LM    | Beta Regression  | ZIB             | ZOIB             | Ordered Beta     |
|-----------------|------|----------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|
| b_Intercept     | Mean | 0.257          | -0.825           | -0.828          | -0.826           | -0.867           |
|                 | Cr.I | [0.199, 0.314] | [-1.092, -0.555] | [-1.08, -0.568] | [-1.088, -0.557] | [-1.125, -0.605] |
|                 | pd   | 1.000***       | 1.000***         | 1.000***        | 1.000***         | 1.000***         |
| b_Fluency       | Mean | 0.085          | 0.198            | 0.200           | 0.199            | 0.263            |
|                 | Cr.I | [0, 0.172]     | [-0.15, 0.536]   | [-0.129, 0.524] | [-0.139, 0.537]  | [-0.064, 0.584]  |
|                 | pd   | 0.975*         | 0.876            | 0.885           | 0.876            | 0.949            |
| sigma           | Mean | 0.208          | -                | -               | -                | -                |
|                 | Cr.I | [0.181, 0.241] | -                | -               | -                | -                |
|                 | pd   | 1.000***       | -                | -               | -                | -                |
| b_phi_Intercept | Mean | -              | 1.593            | 1.598           | 1.596            | 1.618            |
|                 | Cr.I | -              | [1.153, 1.993]   | [1.175, 1.98]   | [1.179, 1.98]    | [1.187, 1.99]    |
|                 | pd   | -              | 1.000***         | 1.000***        | 1.000***         | 1.000***         |
| b_phi_Fluency   | Mean | -              | 0.436            | 0.433           | 0.433            | 0.403            |
|                 | Cr.I | -              | [-0.151, 1.032]  | [-0.127, 0.997] | [-0.13, 1.007]   | [-0.158, 0.985]  |
|                 | pd   | -              | 0.920            | 0.938           | 0.931            | 0.920            |
| b_zi_Intercept  | Mean | -              | -                | -1.663          | -                | -                |
|                 | Cr.I | -              | -                | [-2.45, -0.97]  | -                | -                |
|                 | pd   | -              | -                | 1.000***        | -                | -                |
| b_zi_Fluency    | Mean | -              | -                | -2.180          | -                | -                |
|                 | Cr.I | -              | -                | [-4.7, -0.318]  | -                | -                |
|                 | pd   | -              | -                | 0.991**         | -                | -                |
| b_zoi_Intercept | Mean | -              | -                | -               | -1.547           | -                |
|                 | Cr.I | -              | -                | -               | [-2.304, -0.865] | -                |
|                 | pd   | -              | -                | -               | 1.000***         | -                |
| b_zoi_Fluency   | Mean | -              | -                | -               | -2.284           | -                |
|                 | Cr.I | -              | -                | -               | [-4.685, -0.505] | -                |
|                 | pd   | -              | -                | -               | 0.996***         | -                |
| b_coi_Intercept | Mean | -              | -                | -               | -2.074           | -                |
|                 | Cr.I | -              | -                | -               | [-4.511, -0.281] | -                |
|                 | pd   | -              | -                | -               | 0.991**          | -                |
| b_coi_Fluency   | Mean | -              | -                | -               | 0.239            | -                |
|                 | Cr.I | -              | -                | -               | [-6.163, 5.455]  | -                |
|                 | pd   | -              | -                | -               | 0.576            | -                |

Note. Link functions: b\_mean = logit; b\_phi = log; b\_zoi (zero-one inflation) = logit; b\_coi (conditional one-inflation) = logit. Asterisks reflect approximate two-sided p-values derived from the posterior pd. pd  $\geq$  0.975 ( $p \leq .05$ ) = \*; pd  $\geq$  0.990 ( $p \leq .01$ ) = \*\*; pd  $\geq$  0.998 ( $p \leq .001$ ) = \*\*\*.

**Figure 10**

*Posterior predictive check for ordered beta regression model. A. Discrete posterior check. B. Continuous posterior check.*



615

## Discussion


616        The use of beta regression in psychology, and the social sciences in general, is rare. With this tutorial,  
 617        we hope to turn the tides. beta regression models are an attractive alternative to models that impose unrealistic  
 618        assumptions like normality, linearity, homoscedasticity, and unbounded data. Beyond these models, there  
 619        are a diverse array of different models that can be used depending on your outcome of interest.

620        Throughout this tutorial our main aim was to help guide researchers in running analyses with pro-  
 621        portional or percentage outcomes using beta regression and some of its alternatives. In the current example,  
 622        we used real data from Wilford et al. (2020) and discussed how to fit these models in R, interpret model  
 623        parameters, extract predicted probabilities and marginal effects, and visualize the results.

624        Comparing our analysis with that of Wilford et al. (2020), we demonstrated that using a traditional  
 625        approach (e.g.,  $t$ -test) to analyze mean accuracy data can lead to biased inferences. Although we successfully  
 626        reproduced one of their key findings, our use of beta regression and its extensions revealed important nuances  
 627        in the results. With a traditional beta regression model—which accounts for both the mean and the precision  
 628        (dispersion)—we observed similar effects of instructor fluency on performance. However, the standard beta

**Figure 11**

*Heiss plot of predicted probabilities across the scale (0-100)*



Plot shows predicted proportions of the components of a bounded scale, i.e. the predicted (expected) probability of the top value of the scale, the intermediate continuous values, and the bottom value of the scale. The predictions are subset for unique values of a grouping factor. The predictions are shown for multiple posterior draws to indicate uncertainty. Labels on components indicate posterior quantiles for the probability of that component for each level of the grouping variable.

629 model does not accommodate boundary values (i.e., 0s and 1s).


630 When we applied a ZIB model, which explicitly accounts for structural 0s, we found no effect of  
 631 fluency on the mean ( $\mu$ ) part of the model. Instead, the effect of fluency emerged in the structural zero  
 632 (inflated zero;  $\alpha$ ) component. This pattern was consistent when using a zero-one-inflated beta (ZOIB) model.  
 633 Furthermore, we fit an ordered beta regression model (Kubinec, 2022), which appropriately models the full  
 634 range of values, including 0s and 1s. Here, we did not observe a reliable effect of fluency on the mean once  
 635 we accounted for dispersion.

636 These analyses emphasize the importance of fitting a model that aligns with the nature of the data.  
 637 The simplest and recommended approach when dealing with data that contains 0s and/or 1s is to fit an ordered  
 638 beta model, assuming the process is truly continuous. However, if you believe the process is distinct in nature,  
 639 a ZIB or ZOIB model might be a better choice. Ultimately, this decision should be guided by theory.

640 For instance, if we believe fluency influences the boundaries (0 and 1), we might want to model  
 641 this process separately using a ZIB or ZOIB. With the current dataset, fluency might affect specific aspects  
 642 of performance (such as the likelihood of complete failure) rather than general performance levels. This  
 643 effect could be due to participant disengagement during the disfluent lecture. If students fail to pay attention  
 644 because of features of disfluency, they may miss relevant information, leading to a floor effect at the test.  
 645 Following from this, disfluency would be expected to influence the boundary (0) and not the continuous part  
 646 of the model. If this is the case, we would want to model this appropriately. However, if we believe fluency

**Figure 12**

The plots show 100 posterior predicted distributions with the label  $y_{rep}$  (light blue), the distribution of accuracy as function of fluency in dark blue for regular regression (A), beta regression (B), and ZIB (C) models



647 effects general performance levels (the continuous part), a model that takes in to account the entire process  
 648 accounting for the 0s and 1s might be appropriate.

649 In the discussion section of Wilford et al. (2020), they were unable to offer a tenable explanation for  
 650 performance differences based on instructor fluency. A model that accounts for the excess 0s in the dataset  
 651 provides one testable explanation: watching a disfluent lecture may lead to lapses in attention, resulting  
 652 in poorer performance in that group. These lapses, in turn, contribute to the observed differences in the  
 653 fluent condition. This modeling approach opens a promising avenue for future research—one that would have  
 654 remained inaccessible otherwise.

655 Not everyone will be eager to implement the techniques discussed herein. In such cases, the key  
 656 question becomes: What is the least problematic approach to handling proportional data? One reasonable  
 657 option is to fit multiple models tailored to the specific characteristics of your data. For example, if your data  
 658 contain 0s, you might fit two models: a traditional linear model excluding the 0s, and a logistic model to  
 659 account for the zero versus non-zero distinction. If your data contain both 0s and 1s, you could fit separate  
 660 models for the 0s and 1s in addition to the OLS model. There are many defensible strategies to choose from  
 661 depending on the context. However, we do not recommend transforming the values of your data (e.g., 0s to

662 .01 and 1s to .99) or ignoring the properties of your data simply to fit traditional statistical models.

663 In this tutorial, we demonstrated how to analyze these models from a Bayesian perspective. While we  
 664 recognize that not everyone identifies as a Bayesian, implementing these models using a Bayesian framework  
 665 is relatively straightforward—it requires only a single package, lowering the barrier to entry. For those who  
 666 prefer frequentist analyses, several R packages are available. For example, the `{betareg}` package (Cribari-  
 667 Neto & Zeileis, 2010) `{glmmTMB}` (Brooks et al., 2017) and `{gamlss}` (2005) are nice options. To this end,  
 668 I have included supplemental materials demonstrating how to use frequentist packages to analyze the data  
 669 presented herein.

## 670 Conclusion

671 Overall, this tutorial emphasizes the importance of modeling the data you have. Although the ex-  
 672 ample provided is relatively simple (a one-factor model with two levels), we hope it demonstrates that even  
 673 with a basic dataset, there is much nuance in interpretation and inference. Properly modeling your data  
 674 can lead to deeper insights, far beyond what traditional measures might offer. With the tools introduced in  
 675 this tutorial, researchers now have the means to analyze their data effectively, uncover patterns, make ac-  
 676 curate predictions, and support their findings with robust statistical evidence. By applying these modeling  
 677 techniques, researchers can improve the validity and reliability of their studies, ultimately leading to more  
 678 informed decisions and advancements in their respective fields.

## 679 References

- 680 Arel-Bundock, V. (2024). *Marginaleffects: Predictions, comparisons, slopes, marginal means, and hypoth-*  
*681 esis tests*. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=marginaleffects>
- 682 Arel-Bundock, V., Greifer, N., & Heiss, A. (2024). How to interpret statistical models using marginaleffects  
 683 for R and Python. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 111(9), 1–32. <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v111.i09>
- 684 Bartlett, M. S. (1936). The Square Root Transformation in Analysis of Variance. *Journal of the Royal*  
*685 Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 3(1), 68–78. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2983678>
- 686 Bendixen, T., & Purzycki, B. G. (2023). Cognitive and cultural models in psychological science: A tutorial  
 687 on modeling free-list data as a dependent variable in Bayesian regression. *Psychological Methods*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/met0000553>
- 688 Brooks, M. E., Kristensen, K., van, K. J., Magnusson, A., Berg, C. W., Nielsen, A., Skaug, H. J., Maechler,  
 689 M., & Bolker, B. M. (2017). *{glmmTMB} balances speed and flexibility among packages for zero-inflated*  
*690 generalized linear mixed modeling*. 9. <https://doi.org/10.32614/RJ-2017-066>
- 691 Bürkner, P.-C. (2017). *{Brms}: An {r} package for {bayesian} multilevel models using {stan}*. 80. <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v080.i01>
- 692 Bürkner, P.-C., Gabry, J., Kay, M., & Vehtari, A. (2025). *posterior: Tools for working with posterior distri-*  
*693 butions*. <https://mc-stan.org/posterior/>
- 694 Bürkner, P.-C., & Vuorre, M. (2019). Ordinal Regression Models in Psychology: A Tutorial. *Ad-*  
*695 vances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science*, 2(1), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2515245918823199>
- 696 Carpenter, S. K., Wilford, M. M., Kornell, N., & Mullaney, K. M. (2013). Appearances can be deceiving:  
 697 instructor fluency increases perceptions of learning without increasing actual learning. *Psychonomic*  
*698 Bulletin & Review*, 20(6), 1350–1356. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-013-0442-z>
- 699 Cohen, J. (1977). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*, rev. ed. Lawrence Erlbaum Asso-  
 700 ciates, Inc.
- 701 Coretta, S., & Bürkner, P.-C. (2025). *Bayesian beta regressions with brms in r: A tutorial for phoneticians*.  
 702 [https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/f9rqg\\_v1](https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/f9rqg_v1).

- 706 Costello, T. H. et al. (2024). Durably reducing conspiracy beliefs through dialogues with AI. *Science*, 385,  
707 eadq1814. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.adq1814>
- 708 Cribari-Neto, F., & Zeileis, A. (2010). *Beta regression in {r}*. 34. <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v034.i02>
- 709 Dolstra, E., & contributors, T. N. (2006). *Nix* [Computer software]. <https://nixos.org/>
- 710 Ferrari, S., & Cribari-Neto, F. (2004). Beta Regression for Modelling Rates and Proportions. *Journal of  
711 Applied Statistics*, 31(7), 799–815. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0266476042000214501>
- 712 Fullerton, A. S., & Anderson, K. F. (2021). Ordered Regression Models: a Tutorial. *Prevention Science*,  
713 24(3), 431–443. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11121-021-01302-y>
- 714 Gabry, J., Češnovar, R., Johnson, A., & Brodner, S. (2024). *Cmdstanr: R interface to 'CmdStan'*. <https://mc-stan.org/cmdstanr/>
- 715 Gelman, A., Carlin, J. B., Stern, H. S., Dunson, D. B., Vehtari, A., & Rubin, D. B. (2013). *Bayesian data  
716 analysis* (Third). CRC. <https://stat.columbia.edu/~gelman/book/>
- 717 Heiss, A. (2021). *A guide to modeling proportions with bayesian beta and zero-inflated beta regression  
718 models*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.59350/7p1a4-0tw75>
- 719 James, A. N., Ryskin, R., Hartshorne, J. K., Backs, H., Bala, N., Barcenas-Meade, L., Bhattacharai, S., Charles,  
720 T., Copoulos, G., Coss, C., Eisert, A., Furuhashi, E., Ginell, K., Guttman-McCabe, A., Harrison, E.  
721 (Chaz)., Hoban, L., Hwang, W. A., Iannetta, C., Koenig, K. M., ... Leeuw, J. R. de. (2025). What  
722 Paradigms Can Webcam Eye-Tracking Be Used For? Attempted Replications of Five Cognitive Science  
723 Experiments. *Collabra: Psychology*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.1525/collabra.140755>
- 724 Johnson, A., Ott, M., & Dogucu, M. (2022). *Bayes rules!: An introduction to applied bayesian modeling*.  
725 Routledge & CRC Press.
- 726 Kneib, T., Silbersdorff, A., & Säfken, B. (2023). Rage Against the Mean – A Review of Distributional  
727 Regression Approaches. *Econometrics and Statistics*, 26, 99–123. [https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecosta.2021.07.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecosta.2021.<br/>728 07.006)
- 729 Kong, E. J., & Edwards, J. (2016). Individual differences in categorical perception of speech: Cue weighting  
730 and executive function. *Journal of Phonetics*, 59, 40–57. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wocn.2016.08.006>
- 731 Kornell, N., & Bjork, R. A. (2008). Learning Concepts and Categories. *Psychological Science*, 19(6), 585–  
732 592. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02127.x>
- 733 Kosmidis, I., & Zeileis, A. (2025). Extended-support beta regression for [0, 1] responses. *Journal of the  
734 Royal Statistical Society Series C: Applied Statistics*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/rssc/qlaf039>
- 735 Kruschke, J. K. (2013). Bayesian estimation supersedes the t test. *Journal of Experimental Psychology:  
736 General*, 142(2), 573–603. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029146>
- 737 Kruschke, J. K. (2015). *Doing bayesian data analysis: A tutorial with r, JAGS, and stan* (2nd ed.). Academic  
738 Press.
- 739 Kruschke, J. K. (2018). Rejecting or Accepting Parameter Values in Bayesian Estimation. *Advances in Meth-  
740 ods and Practices in Psychological Science*, 1(2), 270–280. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2515245918771304>
- 741 Kubinec, R. (2022). Ordered Beta Regression: A Parsimonious, Well-Fitting Model for Continuous Data  
742 with Lower and Upper Bounds. *Political Analysis*, 31(4), 519–536. <https://doi.org/10.1017/pan.2022.20>
- 743 Kubinec, R. (2023). *Ordbetareg: Ordered beta regression models with 'brms'*. [https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=ordbetareg](https://CRAN.R-project.org/<br/>744 package=ordbetareg)
- 745 Lenth, R. V. (2025). *Emmeans: Estimated marginal means, aka least-squares means*. [https://doi.org/10.32614/CRAN.package.emmeans](https://doi.org/10.<br/>746 32614/CRAN.package.emmeans)
- 747 Liu, F., & Kong, Y. (2015). zoib: An R Package for Bayesian Inference for Beta Regression and Zero/One  
748 Inflated Beta Regression. *The R Journal*, 7(2), 34. <https://doi.org/10.32614/rj-2015-019>
- 749 Lüdecke, D., Ben-Shachar, M. S., Patil, I., Wiernik, B. M., Bacher, E., Thériault, R., & Makowski,  
750 D. (2022). *Easystats: Framework for easy statistical modeling, visualization, and reporting*. [https://easystats.github.io/easystats/](https://<br/>751 easystats.github.io/easystats/)
- 752 Makowski, D., Ben-Shachar, M. S., Chen, S. H. A., & Lüdecke, D. (2019). Indices of effect existence and

- 754 significance in the bayesian framework. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02767>
- 755
- 756 Makowski, D., Ben-Shachar, M., & Lüdecke, D. (2019). bayestestR: Describing effects and their uncertainty,  
757 existence and significance within the bayesian framework. *Journal of Open Source Software*, 4(40), 1541.  
758 <https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.01541>
- 759 Makowski, D., Neves, A., & Field, A. P. (2025). *Introducing the choice-confidence (CHOCO) model for  
760 bimodal data from subjective ratings: Application to the effect of attractiveness on reality beliefs about  
761 AI-generated faces*. [https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/z68v3\\_v1](https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/z68v3_v1)
- 762 Marsman, M., & Wagenmakers, E.-J. (2016). Three Insights from a Bayesian Interpretation of the One-Sided  
763 P Value. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164416669201>
- 764 Martin, K., Cornero, F. M., Clayton, N. S., Adam, O., Obin, N., & Dufour, V. (2024). Vocal complexity in a  
765 socially complex corvid: Gradation, diversity and lack of common call repertoire in male rooks. *Royal  
766 Society Open Science*, 11(1), 231713. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.231713>
- 767 McCabe, C. J., Halvorson, M. A., King, K. M., Cao, X., & Kim, D. S. (2021). Interpreting Interaction Effects  
768 in Generalized Linear Models of Nonlinear Probabilities and Counts. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*,  
769 57(2-3), 243–263. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00273171.2020.1868966>
- 770 McElreath, R. (2020). *Statistical rethinking: A bayesian course with examples in r and STAN* (2nd ed.).  
771 Chapman; Hall/CRC. <https://doi.org/10.1201/9780429029608>
- 772 Nelder, J. A., & Wedderburn, R. W. M. (1972). Generalized linear models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical  
773 Society. Series A (General)*, 135(3), 370–384. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2344614>
- 774 Nouvian, M., Foster, J. J., & Weidenmüller, A. (2023). Glyphosate impairs aversive learning in bumble-  
775 bees. *Science of The Total Environment*, 898, 165527. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0048969723041505>
- 776 Paolino, P. (2001). Maximum Likelihood Estimation of Models with Beta-Distributed Dependent Variables.  
777 *Political Analysis*, 9(4), 325–346. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.pan.a004873>
- 778 Pfadt, J. M., Bartoš, F., Godmann, H. R., Waaijers, M., Groot, L., Heo, I., & Wagenmakers, E. .... (2025).  
779 A methodological metamorphosis: The rapid rise of bayesian inference and open science practices in  
780 psychology. *Preprint*. [https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/ck3js\\_v1](https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/ck3js_v1)
- 781 R Core Team. (2024). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. R Foundation for Statistical  
782 Computing. <https://www.R-project.org/>
- 783 R. A. Rigby, & D. M. Stasinopoulos. (2005). *Generalized additive models for location, scale and shape,(with  
784 discussion)*. 54, 507–554.
- 785 Rodrigues, B., & Baumann, P. (2025). *Rix: Reproducible data science environments with 'nix'*. <https://docs.ropensci.org/rix/>
- 786 Rohrer, J. M., & Arel-Bundock, V. (2025). *Models as prediction machines: How to convert confusing coef-  
787 ficients into clear quantities*. [https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/g4s2a\\_v1](https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/g4s2a_v1)
- 788 Shrestha, S., Sigdel, K., Pokharel, M., & Columbus, S. (2024). Big five traits predict between- and within-  
789 person variation in loneliness. *European Journal of Personality*, 08902070241239834. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08902070241239834>
- 790 Sladekova, M., & Field, A. P. (2024). *In search of unicorns: Assessing statistical assumptions in real psy-  
791 chology datasets*. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/4rznt>
- 792 Smith, K. E., Panlilio, L. V., Feldman, J. D., Grundmann, O., Dunn, K. E., McCurdy, C. R., Garcia-  
793 Romeu, A., & Epstein, D. H. (2024). Ecological momentary assessment of self-reported kratom use,  
794 effects, and motivations among US adults. *JAMA Network Open*, 7(1), e2353401. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2023.53401>
- 795 Smithson, M., & Verkuilen, J. (2006). A better lemon squeezer? Maximum-likelihood regression with  
796 beta-distributed dependent variables. *Psychological Methods*, 11(1), 54–71. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1082-989x.11.1.54>
- 797
- 798
- 799
- 800
- 801

- 802 Team, S. D. (2023). *Stan: A probabilistic programming language*. <https://mc-stan.org>
- 803 Toftness, A. R., Carpenter, S. K., Geller, J., Lauber, S., Johnson, M., & Armstrong, P. I. (2017). Instructor  
804 fluency leads to higher confidence in learning, but not better learning. *Metacognition and Learning*,  
805 13(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11409-017-9175-0>
- 806 Vuorre, M. (2019, February 18). *How to Analyze Visual Analog (Slider) Scale Data?* <https://vuorre.com/posts/2019-02-18-analyze-analog-scale-ratings-with-zero-one-inflated-beta-models>
- 807 Wickham, H., Çetinkaya-Rundel, M., & Grolemund, G. (2023). *Rfor Data Science: Import, Tidy, Transform,  
808 Visualize, and Model Data*. O'Reilly. <https://r4ds.hadley.nz/>
- 809 Wilford, M. M., Kurpad, N., Platt, M., & Weinstein-Jones, Y. (2020). Lecturer fluency can impact students'  
810 judgments of learning and actual learning performance. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 34(6), 1444–  
811 1456. <https://doi.org/10.1002/acp.3724>
- 812 Wilkes, L. N., Barner, A. K., Keyes, A. A., Morton, D., Byrnes, J. E. K., & Dee, L. E. (2024). Quantifying  
813 co-extinctions and ecosystem service vulnerability in coastal ecosystems experiencing climate warming.  
814 *Global Change Biology*, 30(7), e17422. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.17422>
- 815 Witherby, A. E., & Carpenter, S. K. (2022). The impact of lecture fluency and technology fluency on students'  
816 online learning and evaluations of instructors. *Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition*,  
817 11(4), 500–509. <https://doi.org/10.1037/mac0000003>
- 818 Ye, M., & Heiss, A. (2023). Enforcing Boundaries: China's Overseas NGO Law and Operational Con-  
819 straints for Global Civil Society. *Working Paper*. <https://stats.andrewheiss.com/compassionate-clam/manuscript/output/manuscript.html>
- 820
- 821